

3. List Policy
1 copy & H.C. 54

~~SECRET~~

December 15th, 1959

COCOM Document No. 3711.NI 1/2

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

ON

NEW CHEMICAL AND PETROLEUM EQUIPMENT ITEM NO.1

9th December, 1959

Present: Belgium (Luxembourg), France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Documents Nos. 3700.5, 3711.00/1, 3711.NI 1/1, New Item No. 1/W.P.1 and 2.

1. At the opening of the second round of discussion the GERMAN Delegate recalled that in another connection the United Kingdom Delegate had drawn the Committee's attention to the need, before adding any new item to the International Lists, to make quite sure that the definition would not cover products which ought not to be covered, and to the desirability of an understanding that the matter should be open to review at any time.

2. The FRENCH, ITALIAN and UNITED KINGDOM Delegations having endorsed the above sentiments, the GERMAN Delegate stated that, on that express condition, the German Delegation were prepared to accept parts (b) and (c) of the United States proposal.

3. The BELGIAN Delegate said that his authorities had no strong views on this matter and before taking up a position had asked him to report the present discussion.

4. The UNITED STATES Delegate said that, as requested by the Committee, his Government had examined the possibility of fixing cut-offs. They had found a cut-off reasonable and feasible only in the case of sub-item (a), which they were willing to complete as follows:

(a) Consumable electrode vacuum arc furnaces with a capacity in excess of 3 tons.

5. The JAPANESE and NETHERLANDS Delegations accepted the United States proposal in its entirety.

6. The ITALIAN Delegation accepted all parts of the definition ad referendum and subject to the understanding set out in paragraph 1 above.

7. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegation accepted sub-item (c) ad referendum. They believed that some furnaces covered under (a) would be covered equally under (b). The United States Delegation explained the limited degree of dual coverage involved, but expressed the view that this should create no real problem.

8. The FRENCH Delegation were unable to accept sub-item (a) in its original form. They would examine the new proposal and express their views within a few days. In a spirit of compromise they would accept parts (b) and (c) subject to the understanding as to later review (see paragraph 1 above).

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

- 2 -

COCOM Document No. 3711.NI 1/2

9. The GERMAN Delegate undertook to submit to his Government the change in part (a) just proposed by the United States Delegation. He considered, however, that it was likely to have little effect on their strategic evaluation of such furnaces.

10. The CHAIRMAN pointed out that the Belgian Delegate had not yet taken up a position. Otherwise, part (c) had been accepted unanimously, some Delegations having agreed on an ad referendum basis; part (b) had been accepted by all save the United Kingdom Delegation; and a study of the new cut-off for part (a) was being undertaken by the French, German and United Kingdom Delegations. He appealed to the last-named to endeavour also to accept part (b).

11. The COMMITTEE agreed to resume the study of the proposed new item on the 14th December.

~~SECRET~~